

**DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION  
CORRECTIONS STANDARDS AUTHORITY**



**PHASE I OF A TWO-PHASE PROCESS:  
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ)  
APPLICATION PACKET  
TITLE II FORMULA BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM**

**March 2011**

***RFQ Applications must be received by the Corrections Standards Authority  
by 5:00 p.m., Friday, April 8, 2011***

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

GRANT REQUIREMENTS AND RFQ PROCESS

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PHASE I, RFQ

RFQ APPLICATION

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Key Program Priority Areas

Appendix B – Notifications

Appendix C – RFQ Evaluation Process

### **FEDERAL TITLE II FORMULA BLOCK GRANT FUNDING OPPORTUNITY ANNOUNCEMENT**

#### **Background**

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 2002 reauthorized the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to administer the Formula Grants program, which supports state and local delinquency prevention/intervention efforts and juvenile justice system improvements. Congress appropriates funds and OJJDP awards them to states on the basis of their proportionate population under age 18. Programs administered under this funding stream support State and local efforts in planning, operating, and evaluating projects that seek to prevent at-risk youth from entering the juvenile justice system or intervene with first-time and nonserious offenders, and to provide direct services that maximize their chances of leading productive, successful lives.

As the designated State agency that administers the federal juvenile justice grants programs, the Corrections Standards Authority (CSA), pursuant to the JJDP Act, is required to establish a State Advisory Group. In California, this group is known as the State Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (SACJJDP) and has responsibilities that include: 1) participating in the development and review of the State's three-year juvenile justice plan; 2) reviewing grant applications; 3) providing recommendations regarding the State's compliance with the core protections of the JJDP Act; and 4) reviewing the progress of projects funded under the State plan.

For States to receive a Formula Grant award, they must comply with [four core requirements](#) of the JJDP Act:

- Deinstitutionalization of status offenders (DSO);
- Separation of juveniles from adults in institutions (separation);
- Removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups (jail removal); and
- Reduction of [Disproportionate Minority Contact](#) (DMC)

Regarding DMC, states must demonstrate a good faith effort to address DMC, which refers to the overrepresentation of youth of color who come into contact with the juvenile justice system (at all points, from arrest through confinement) relative to their numbers in the general population. For more information on the legislative history of DMC, tools for examining DMC, and research studies/resources related to DMC, prospective grantees are encouraged to visit OJJDP's DMC web site at: <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/dmc/>.

In carrying out its responsibilities, California's SACJJDP serves as an Executive Steering Committee (ESC) of the Corrections Standards Authority (CSA). The SACJJDP, as an ESC, is a model for making better decisions pertaining to activities, projects and programs that will be implemented through the use of SACJJDP subject matter experts. Specific responsibilities often include the development of the technical requirements, rating criteria and evaluation method for the proposal process. The CSA makes final funding decisions based on the recommendations of the SACJJDP. Due to the complexity of assigned tasks, the SACJJDP has established smaller ESC workgroups to ensure the appropriate expertise and allocation of resources are committed. The Title II Systems Reform Grant Program ESC was established solely for the purpose of developing this funding opportunity and tasked with making the most informed decisions possible.

As the designated State agency that distributes funds under the federal Title II grant program, the Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) is distributing this Request for Qualification (RFQ) to qualified agencies/organizations, inviting them to compete for grant funds to implement programs that reduce

juvenile offending.

**Eligible applicants for these funds are local California public and private agencies  
and federally recognized tribal governments**

## Attachment B

---

Through the development of the SACJJDP's Strategic Plan and the most recent Title II Formula Grant Comprehensive Three-Year State Plan, the Committee has allocated Title II Formula Grant funds to three key program priority areas for the purposes of this solicitation (Appendix A):

- Effective alternatives to detention/incarceration
- Holistic approaches to offender counsel (providing youthful offenders consistent wrap-around services focused on reducing youthful offending by providing meaningful and necessary services during the court jurisdictional process for the youth and family)
- Restorative justice methods for holding juveniles accountable and repairing the harm caused by juvenile offending

**A total of \$4.6 million dollars** in federal funds is available for the 2011/2012 Title II Grant period with a maximum grant award of \$350,000 per proposed project within large counties, \$300,000 per proposed project within medium counties and \$250,000 within small counties (See Appendix D for County Size Breakdown) for one-year grants - with the possibility of two additional years of funding - to qualified applicants. Only one RFQ application may be submitted by eligible applicants/agencies/departments/organizations/tribal governments as a lead agency although applicants may partner with other applying agencies, departments, organizations, and tribal governments where they are not the lead agency.

Federal funds must be used to supplement existing funds for program activities and must not replace those funds that have been appropriated for the same purpose. Supplanting will be the subject of application review, as well as pre-award review, post-award monitoring, and audit. If there is a potential presence of supplanting, the applicant or grantee will be required to supply documentation demonstrating that the reduction in non-Federal resources occurred for reasons other than the receipt or expected receipt of Federal funds.

### **Grant Requirements and RFQ Process**

The Title II Grant application process will be conducted in two Phases. In Phase I (current solicitation), applicants are required to submit a short qualification application describing their proposed programs. Each RFQ must include:

1. A one-page fact sheet for describing various aspects of the applicant's organization
2. A one-page program description
3. A two-page description of aspects of the program design

This Phase I RFQ **will not** result in award funding. The Title II Executive Steering Committee (ESC) will review, evaluate and rank the qualification applications submitted in Phase I to determine the top 30 proposals to compete in Phase II, tentatively scheduled for mid-July.

Applicants must be aware of further responsibilities related to the federal funding and program requirements. These are provided in Appendix B for your review prior to RFQ application.

In Phase II, those applicants who are invited to participate in the Request for Proposals (RFP) process will be asked to provide a more detailed description of their programs. Proposals will be scored in terms of a number of specifically defined rating factors. Grant funds will be awarded in the order of the Phase II rankings until all available funds have been allocated.

Proposal submission:

**RFQs must be received at the CSA office in Sacramento no later than**

## Attachment B

---

**5:00 PM on Friday, April 8, 2011.**

Applicants must submit one original of the signed RFQ application. Proposals may be mailed or hand delivered to the attention of Helene Zentner, Field Representative for the Corrections Standards Authority, at 600 Bercut Drive, Sacramento, CA 95811.

### **Instructions for Phase I, Request for Qualification (RFQ)**

#### **Phase I. Part 1: Organization Background**

Part 1 of the RFQ requests information about the history and characteristics of the applicant's organization. An applicant's organizational capability is a crucial aspect of this grant competition. This section must not exceed **two (2) pages** excluding the resume requested. Please provide narrative within the fill-in format (Tahoma font, 11-font size, 1.5-spaced).

#### **Phase I. Part 2: Description of the Program**

To successfully compete for grant funds, applicants must describe a program that satisfies the following criteria. The program must:

1. Include research suggesting efficacy of the basic program model; additionally, the project must include some innovative aspect, the effectiveness of which will be studied as part of the grant program.
2. Address one or more of the three grant priorities (stated above).
3. Result in augmenting the body of knowledge regarding what works in reducing the rate of juvenile offending.

The Phase I. Part 2 description of the program must not exceed **one (1) page**. Please provide narrative within the fill-in format (Tahoma font, 11-font size, 1.5-spaced).

#### **Phase I. Part 3: Design Aspects Description of the Program**

The applicant should include those aspects of the program method, design and management that are most important for a well conceived, culturally competent, effective and well managed program. Topics might include the initial program-design process or the applicant's approach to program-participant follow-up, or anything in between. It is important that an applicant provide the program details that would serve to convince the CSA Executive Steering Committee that the result will be a high quality program. This portion of the RFQ must not exceed **two (2) pages**. Please provide narrative within the fill-in format (Tahoma font, 11-font size, 1.5-spaced).

### **Contact Information**

Questions about the Title II Formula Block Grant Program RFQ and/or the RFQ/RFP process should be directed to Shaline Hunter, Field Representative, at 916-322-8081 / [shalinee.hunter@cdcr.ca.gov](mailto:shalinee.hunter@cdcr.ca.gov) or Helene Zentner, Field Representative, at 916-323-8631 / [helene.zentner@cdcr.ca.gov](mailto:helene.zentner@cdcr.ca.gov).

## Attachment B

### Phase I. Part 1: Organization Background

*KEY PROGRAM PRIORITY AREA:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Total Annual Grant Funds Requested: \$* \_\_\_\_\_

1. Name of Lead Agency/Organization	
1a. If Joint Application, List Each Partnering Agency/Organization	
2. Mission Statement of Lead Agency/Organization	
3. Number of Years in Operation	
4. Name of Executive Director (CEO) (attach resume with Phase I RFQ)	
5. Address of Agency/Organization	
6. Contact Person	Name: Phone: Email: Website:
7. Type of Agency/Organization (Public, Private Sector) 7a. If Private Sector: For Profit, Non-Profit	<input type="checkbox"/> For Profit <span style="margin-left: 100px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Non-Profit</span>
8. Primary Services Provided	
9. Total Number of Employees	
10. Annual Organizational Budget	
11. Percentage of Organization's total budget allocated toward Administrative Overhead	
12. Percentage of Funds Received from Categories of Sources	<input type="checkbox"/> Fee for Service                      % <input type="checkbox"/> Grants                                      % <input type="checkbox"/> Donations                                  % <input type="checkbox"/> County/City General Funds              % <input type="checkbox"/> Enterprise Funds                          % <input type="checkbox"/> Special Funds                               % <input type="checkbox"/> Other     %
13. Provide a Brief Description, including Program Title, of your agency's most significant and successful projects within the last five (5) years ( <b><i>no more than two (2) examples</i></b> ). Include what partnering agencies, departments and/or stakeholders actively participated in each program and what were significant program outcomes.  *Questions number 14-17 should reflect numbers corresponding to programs identified in question 13.	A. Program Service-Type: <input type="checkbox"/> System Change <input type="checkbox"/> Direct Service  Youth Served: <input type="checkbox"/> At-Risk Youth <input type="checkbox"/> System Involved Youth   B. Program Service-Type: <input type="checkbox"/> System Change <input type="checkbox"/> Direct Service  Youth Served: <input type="checkbox"/> At-Risk Youth <input type="checkbox"/> System Involved Youth



## Attachment B

---

14. Number of Participants Currently Receiving Services (by program type)	
15. Average Duration of Service Per Participant	
16. Total Number of Participants Successfully Completing Organization's Program(s) in the Last Five (5) Years, including elements/measures defining successful completion	
17. Have there been evaluations – <u>both process and outcome</u> - completed on your programs within the last three (3) years	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, provide the title, author and date of publication for each evaluation report. <i>Note: if invited to participate in Phase II, Request for Proposals (RFP), copies of these reports will be required.</i>

\_\_\_\_\_  
Authorized Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Printed Name and Title:

**Phase I. Part 2: Description of the Program**

**Phase I. Part 3: Design Aspects Description of the Program**

### **APPENDIX A** **Key Program Priority Areas**

#### **Alternatives to Detention -**

Research has shown that juvenile detention has critical, long-lasting consequences for court-involved youth. Youth who are detained are more likely than their counterparts to be formally charged, adjudicated and committed to an institution. Detention disrupts already tenuous connections in school, services and families. Over the long-haul, the detention experience negatively impacts educational and employment levels. In California, many youth are detained pre- and post-adjudication for offenses posing no threat to themselves or the public and where there is no indication of flight risk. Community based alternatives are an underutilized option for addressing the vast majority of youthful offender behavior that lies outside the parameters of public safety and/or flight risk.

#### Goal:

Reduce the number of youth held in secure detention.

#### **Holistic Approach to Counsel -**

The national report, "A Call for Justice: an Assessment of Access to Counsel and Quality of Representation in Delinquency Proceedings" revealed major failings in juvenile defense across the nation." In California, the streamlined approach to counsel of "one size fits all" is ineffective and costly in terms of resources and improved outcomes for youth.

#### Goal:

Promote quality legal defense representation of youth in the juvenile delinquency system in California through well funded children's legal defense systems that emulate best or promising holistic legal practice models.

#### **Restorative Justice Principles -**

Research indicates that the community, victim and offender are best served subsequent to a crime occurring if each is a partner in the development of the justice response. The juvenile justice system in California weighs heavily on the punitive and less on the reparative elements in its response toward youth and crime.

#### Goal:

Restore victims' wounds; restore offenders to law-abiding lives; and repair harm done to interpersonal relationships and the community.

### **APPENDIX B Notifications**

The purpose of the 'Notifications' is two-fold: to provide applicants with an opportunity to understand more fully the State Advisory Committee and the Title II Executive Steering Committee's priorities and corresponding definitions of those priorities; and to provide advance notice regarding expectations for the second part of this competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) process and subsequent grant program.

#### **Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC):**

DMC refers to the disparity and disproportionality of youth of color coming into contact with the justice system. In our vigilance to develop, identify and implement high-quality programs that prevent disparate treatment of youth receiving services and - under the larger context - ensuring programs are not consistent with structural or systematic bias, this application process and subsequent programming requires the applicants view their proposed program through the race/ethnicity lens. In doing so, the applicant will be required to submit an assurance indicating the proposed program will not exacerbate, and if possible reduce, disparity(s) and disproportionality of at-risk or system-involved youth of color and agree to participate in training regarding this issue if chosen as a final grantee.

#### **Systems Improvement/Reform:**

The SACJJD places system reform and improvement of juvenile detention policy and practice at the top of its agenda in an effort to reduce reliance on secure detention of juveniles "garnering substantial long-term savings and allowing for more effective use of public dollars; and improving court services, producing better outcomes for court-involved children, youth, and families, while also enhancing public safety"<sup>1</sup>. This includes programs, research, and other initiatives to examine issues or improve practices, policies, or procedures on a system wide basis (e.g., examining problems affecting decisions from arrest to disposition and detention to corrections). To that end, this funding opportunity encourages applicants to develop their program under the framework of systems reform and, while not overtly, this will be assessed via the applicants' responses throughout the process.

#### **Data Requirements/Components & Progress Reports/Monitoring:**

The Federal Government and the CSA are dedicated to assessing the impact of local projects on the youth directly served by the Title II Formula Block Grant funding. To that end, specific outcome measures are required of grantees. Prospective applicants will need to have the capacity/be prepared to collect and provide specific outcome measures (both short and long term) and by race/ethnicity and gender on a quarterly basis via CSA Progress Reports, if awarded grant dollars. The following list contains examples of data measures that will be collected on the three (3) priority program areas:

- Number of program youth served
- Number and percent of program youth who offend or reoffend
- Number and percent of program youth completing program requirements
- Number and percent of program youth exhibiting a desired change in targeted behaviors: substance abuse; school attendance; gangs; employment status
- Number and percent of program youth charged with formal probation violations
- Number and percent of program youth committed to a detention facility
- Average length of time between intake and referral for program youth
- Number and percent of program youth who are re-victimized
- Number and percent of program families/youth/victims/staff satisfied with the program

In addition, programs awarded grant funds will participate in on-site monitorings by CSA staff on an annual basis.

---

<sup>1</sup> State Level Detention Reform – Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, Annie E. Casey Foundation

## Attachment B

---

### **Resolution of the Governing Board:**

A Resolution of the Governing Board, in support of the grant application must be submitted to the CSA as part of the Request for Proposals (RFP) grant application. Examples of a Governing Board may include: County Board of Supervisors, Organization Board of Directors, Tribal Council, or Nation Council.

### **APPENDIX C RFQ Evaluation Process**

The Phase I RFQ evaluation will consist of the following steps:

- Each member of the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) will read and rank each qualification application.
- The rankings will be forwarded to the Corrections Standards Authority (CSA).
- The rankings will be entered into the computer and analyzed.
- The ESC will convene to discuss the rankings and select the top proposals.
- Approximately, the top 30 ranked proposals will be selected for participation in Phase II.

#### **Ranking Factors/Benchmarks**

Each ESC member will give each application an overall rank score based upon the extent to which the application provides a convincing argument that a high quality, competently conducted, and cost effective program is being proposed.

In assessing the overall quality of a qualification application, the ESC members will consider "benchmarks" or the extent to which:

- The applicant's organization has:
  - The experience and capability to produce a successful program.
  - Sufficient resources to conduct this program, and
  - Conducted successful programs similar to the one being proposed.
- The need for the program is:
  - Well documented with supporting data.
  - Compelling and commensurate with the request for grant funds.
  - Related to the goals of this grant program.
- The program approach and content:
  - Addresses the described need.
  - Is well designed.
  - Describes the program with sufficient detail (including the key elements).
  - Is consistent with the grant goals.
  - Will have a significant impact on the problem being addressed.
  - Will have been developed with a focus on system improvement/reform (as defined in Appendix B).
  - Ensures the proposed program will not exacerbate and if possible reduce the disparity(s) and disproportionality of at-risk or system-involved youth of color (as defined in Appendix B).
- Program evaluation:
  - Goals are clearly stated.
  - Will effectively assess the extent to which the program will be effective.
- The funds requested are:
  - Reasonable and appropriate for the proposed program.
  - Cost effective.
- The application is:
  - Clear and well written.
  - Well organized.
  - Responsive to the RFQ.

#### **Final Ranking**

After the individual ESC rankings of each application have been entered into the computer and analyzed, the

## Attachment B

---

ESC members will convene to determine the final rankings based on the scoring system results and choose the finalists to be invited to participate in Phase II.